UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/653,708	09/02/2003	Peter Wassmann	MS#303971.01 (5069)	2692

321 7590 11/20/2006	**EXAMINER**	
SENNIGER POWERS	RAMPURIA, SATISH	
ONE METROPOLITAN SQUARE		
16TH FLOOR	**ART UNIT**	**PAPER NUMBER**
ST LOUIS, MO 63102	2191	

DATE MAILED: 11/20/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/653,708	WASSMANN ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Satish S. Rampuria	2191	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _02 September 2003_.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-47_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-47_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on _02 September 2003_ is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _See Continuation Sheet_.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is in response to the application filed on September 2, 2003 and

preliminary amendment to the claims filed on August 3, 2004.

2.   Claims 1-47 are pending.

Information Disclosure Statement

3.   An initialed and dated copy of Applicant's IDS form 1449 filed on 3/21/05,

5/18/04, 10/21/03 and 9/02/03 is attached to the instant Office action.

Oath/Declaration

4.   The Office acknowledges receipt of a properly signed oath/declaration filed

12/29/03.

Specification

5.   The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly

indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

The following title is suggested: *Branding Framework for Software Product.*

6.   The use of the trademark "Microsoft and .NET" has been noted in this

application (i.e., pages 15, 17). It should be appropriate or proper term (see MPEP

608.01(v)) used, wherever it appears and be accompanied by the generic

terminology. Although the use of trademarks is permissible in patent applications,

the proprietary nature of the marks should be respected and every effort made to

prevent their use in any manner which might adversely affect their validity as

trademarks.

Drawings

7.   The drawings were received on September 2, 2003. These drawings are

acceptable by the examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

8.   35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter,
or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and
requirements of this title.

9.   Claims 19-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed

invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claim 19 is not limited to tangible embodiments. In view of Applicant's

disclosure, specification page 34 [0109], the medium is not limited to tangible

embodiments, instead being defined as including both tangible embodiments (e.g.,

computer readable medium) and intangible embodiments (e.g., transmission media,

radio frequency (RF), infrared (IR), a carrier wave, telephone line, a signal, etc.).

As such, the claim 19 is not limited to statutory subject matter and is therefore non-

statutory. Claims 20-30 are directly or indirectly dependent on claim 19 and further

support claim 19 and therefore non-statutory. For further explanation see MPEP §

2106.

To overcome this type of 101 rejection the claims need to be amended to

include only the physical computer media and not a transmission media or other

intangible or non-functional media. For the specification at the bottom, carrier

medium and transmission media would be not statutory but storage media would be

statutory.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

10.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102

that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --
(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another
filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an
application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent,
except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects
for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application
designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

11.   Claims 1-12, 14, 18-28, 30-41, 43 and 47 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by US Patent No. 6,694,320 to Ortiz et al.

(hereinafter, Ortiz).

Per claim 1:

Ortiz discloses:

-    A computerized method of branding a software product comprising:

- assigning a namespace to each of a plurality of resource files, said resource files each containing one or more branding resources (col. 1, lines 45-48 "...storing branding information associated with the computer product in a central library...");

- grouping the resource files according to the assigned namespaces (col. 1, lines 45-48 "...storing branding information associated with the computer product in a central library...");

- executing an interface to call a group of resource files as a function of a selected namespace (col. 1, lines 55-60 "...linking to a first library storing routines to access branding data stored in a central library in response to the request; calling the routines in the first library...");.and searching the called group of resource files for one or more of the branding resources to be installed in the software product (col. 1, lines 45-52 "...the at least one routine being called by a software application requesting branding data and extracting the appropriate branding data from the central library in response to the call...").

Per claim 2:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and further, Ortiz discloses:

- further comprising centrally storing the plurality of branding resources (col. 1, lines 45-48 "...storing branding information associated with the computer product in a central library...").

Per claim 3:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and further, Ortiz discloses:

- wherein assigning the namespaces comprises identifying which of the branding resources contained in the resource files correspond to specific brands (col. 1, lines 45-50 "...the called routines loading the central library and extracting branding data from the central library identified in the request; and conveying the extracted branding data to the software application...").

Per claim 4:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and further, Ortiz discloses:

- wherein each of the resource files comprises a dynamic-link library (col. 3, lines 13-19 "...software makes use of dynamic link libraries (DLLs), which provide a simple and compact procedure for software applications to access required branding data...").

Per claim 5:

The rejection of claim 4 is incorporated and further, Ortiz discloses:

- wherein the branding resources reside in one or more of the dynamic-link

    libraries associated therewith (col. 3, lines 19-29 "...cvOEMBrand.DLL holds the

    actual branding data. Thus, all branding data is stored in a single central

    location..."), and wherein executing the interface comprises accessing the

    branding resources in the associated dynamic-link libraries (col. 3, lines 19-29

    "...cvBrandDLL holds a number of routines which are called in response to a

    request for branding data made by a software application to access branding

    data...").

Per claim 6:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and further, Ortiz discloses:

- wherein at least one of the branding resources comprises an image associated

    with the software product (col. 1, lines 63-67 "...The branding data can be stored

    in a version resource in the central library and can include string resources for

    the product names and OEM names. The images can also be stored in the

    version resource in bitmap resources...").

Per claim 7:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and further, Ortiz discloses:

- wherein at least one of the branding resources comprises a character string

    identifying the software product (col. 1, lines 63-67 "...central library and can

include string resources for the product names...").

Per claim 8:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and further, Ortiz discloses:

- further comprising embedding, in each of the resource files, metadata identifying

   the branding resources contained therein, and wherein the called group of

   resource files is searched for the branding resources to be installed in the

   software product based on the embedded metadata (col. 1, lines 63-67 to col. 2,

   lines 1-3 "...The branding data can be stored in a version resource in the central

   library and can include string resources for the product names and OEM names.

   The images can also be stored in the version resource in bitmap resources...").

Per claim 9:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and further, Ortiz discloses:

- wherein each of the resource files has a branding manifest associated therewith

  (col. 3, lines 19-29 "...cvOEMBrand.DLL holds the actual branding data. Thus, all

  branding data is stored in a single central location..."), and further comprising

  identifying the branding resources contained in each of the resource files with the

  associated branding manifest (col. 3, lines 19-29 "...cvBrandDLL holds a number

  of routines which are called in response to a request for <u>branding data made by a</u>

  <u>software application to access branding</u> data...").

Per claim 10:

The rejection of claim 9 is incorporated and further, Ortiz discloses:

- wherein identifying the branding resources includes indicating, with the

  associated branding manifest, whether one or more of the branding resources

  contained in the resource file can be overwritten by a third party (col. 3, lines 19-

  29 "...cvOEMBrand.DLL holds the actual branding data. Thus, all branding data

  is stored in a single central location... cvBrandDLL holds a number of routines

  which are called in response to a request for <u>branding data made by a software</u>

  <u>application to access branding</u> data...").

Per claim 11:

The rejection of claim 9 is incorporated and further, Ortiz discloses:

- wherein identifying the branding resources includes indicating, with the

  associated branding manifest, a resource type for each of the branding resources

contained in the resource file (col. 3, lines 19-29 "...cvOEMBrand.DLL holds the

actual branding data. Thus, all branding data is stored in a single central

location...").

Per claim 12:

The rejection of claim 9 is incorporated and further, Ortiz discloses:

- further comprising adding one or more branding resources to at least one of the

  resource files and updating the branding manifest associated therewith (col. 2,

  lines 15-20 "...the branding data is kept in a compact form, which can be easily

  accessed and updated. As a result, it is a simple and direct procedure to add

  new procedures and branding data and to alter existing procedures and branding

  data...").

Per claim 14:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and further, Ortiz discloses:

- wherein the interface is an application programming interface (col. 1, lines 55-60

  "...linking to a first library storing routines to access branding data stored in a

  central library in response to the request; calling the routines in the first

  library...").

Per claim 18:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and further, Ortiz discloses:

- wherein one or more computer-readable media have computer-executable

    instructions for performing the computerized method of claim 1 (col. 2, lines 4-14

    "...provided a computer readable medium including computer program code for

    accessing branding data stored in a central resource...").

Claims 19-28 and 30 are the computer product claim corresponding to method

claims 1, 3-11 and 14 respectively, and rejected under the same rational set forth

in connection with the rejection of claims 1, 3-11 and 14 respectively, above.

Per claim 31:

Ortiz discloses:

- A computerized method of branding a software product comprising:

- assigning a namespace to each of a plurality of resource files, said resource files

    each containing one or more branding resources (col. 1, lines 45-48 "...storing

    branding information associated with the computer product in a central

    library...");

- embedding, in each of the resource files, metadata identifying the branding

    resources contained therein (col. 1, lines 45-48 "...storing branding information

    associated with the computer product in a central library...");

- executing an interface to call at least one of the resource files as a function of a

    selected namespace (col. 1, lines 55-60 "...linking to a first library storing

routines to access branding data stored in a central library in response to the request; calling the routines in the first library...”); and

- searching the called resource file for one or more of the branding resources to be installed in the software product based on the embedded metadata (col. 1, lines 45-52 “...the at least one routine being called by a software application requesting branding data and extracting the appropriate branding data from the central library in response to the call...”).

Per claim 32:

The rejection of claim 31 is incorporated and further, Ortiz discloses:

- further comprising grouping the resource files according to the assigned namespaces, and wherein the interface calls a group of resource files as a function of a selected namespace (col. 1, lines 45-48 “...storing branding information associated with the computer product in a central library...”).

Per claim 33:

The rejection of claim 31 is incorporated and further, Ortiz discloses:

- further comprising centrally storing the plurality of branding resources (col. 1, lines 45-48 “...storing branding information associated with the computer product in a central library...”).

Per claim 34:

The rejection of claim 31 is incorporated and further, Ortiz discloses:

- wherein assigning the namespaces comprises identifying which of the branding

  resources contained in the resource files correspond to specific brands (col. 1,

  lines 45-50 "...the called routines loading the central library and extracting

  branding data from the central library identified in the request; and conveying the

  extracted branding data to the software application...").

Per claim 35:

The rejection of claim 31 is incorporated and further, Ortiz discloses:

- wherein each of the resource files comprises a dynamic-link library (col. 3, lines

  13-19 "...software makes use of dynamic link libraries (DLLs), which provide a

  simple and compact procedure for software applications to access required

  branding data...").

Per claim 36:

The rejection of claim 35 is incorporated and further, Ortiz discloses:

- wherein the branding resources reside in one or more of the dynamic-link

  libraries associated therewith (col. 3, lines 19-29 "...cvOEMBrand.DLL holds the

  actual branding data. Thus, all branding data is stored in a single central

  location..."), and wherein executing the interface comprises accessing the

  branding resources in the associated dynamic-link libraries (col. 3, lines 19-29

  "...cvBrandDLL holds a number of routines which are called in response to a

request for <u>branding data made by a software application to access branding</u>

<u>data...")</u>.

Per claim 37:

The rejection of claim 31 is incorporated and further, Ortiz discloses:

- wherein at least one of the branding resources comprises an image associated

   with the software product (col. 1, lines 63-67 "...The branding data can be stored

   in a version resource in the central library and can include string resources for

   the product names and OEM names. The images can also be stored in the

   version resource in bitmap resources...").

Per claim 38:

The rejection of claim 31 is incorporated and further, Ortiz discloses:

- wherein at least one of the branding resources comprises a character string

   identifying the software product (col. 1, lines 63-67 "...central library and can

   include string resources for the product names...").

Per claim 39:

The rejection of claim 31 is incorporated and further, Ortiz discloses:

- further comprising indicating, with the embedded metadata, whether one or more

   of the branding resources contained in the resource files can be overwritten by a

third party (col. 3, lines 19-29 "...cvOEMBrand.DLL holds the actual branding

data. Thus, all branding data is stored in a single central location... cvBrandDLL

holds a number of routines which are called in response to a request for <u>branding

data made by a software application to access branding</u> data...").

Per claim 40:

The rejection of claim 39 is incorporated and further, Ortiz discloses:

- further comprising indicating, with the embedded metadata, a resource type for

  each of the branding resources contained in the resource files (col. 1, lines 45-50

  "...the called routines loading the central library and extracting branding data

  from the central library identified in the request; and conveying the extracted

  branding data to the software application...").

Per claim 41:

The rejection of claim 39 is incorporated and further, Ortiz discloses:

- further comprising adding one or more branding resources to at least one of the

  resource files and updating the metadata embedded therein (col. 2, lines 15-20

  "...the branding data is kept in a compact form, which can be easily accessed

  and updated. As a result, it is a simple and direct procedure to add new

  procedures and branding data and to alter existing procedures and branding

  data...").

Per claim 43:

The rejection of claim 31 is incorporated and further, Ortiz discloses:

- wherein the interface is an application programming interface (col. 1, lines 55-60

    "...linking to a first library storing routines to access branding data stored in a

    central library in response to the request; calling the routines in the first

    library...").

Per claim 47:

The rejection of claim 31 is incorporated and further, Ortiz discloses:

- wherein one or more computer-readable media have computer-executable

    instructions for performing the computerized method of claim 31 (col. 2, lines 4-

    14 "...provided a computer readable medium including computer program code

    for accessing branding data stored in a central resource...").

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

12.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

13.   Claims 13, 15, 16, 17, 29, 42, 44, 45, and 46 rejected under 35

U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ortiz in view of US Publication No.

2003/0195921 to Becker et al. (hereinafter, Becker).

Per claims 13:

The rejection of claim 9 is incorporated and further, Ortiz does not explicitly

disclose wherein the branding manifest comprises an extensible markup language file.

However, Becker discloses in an analogous computer system wherein the

branding manifest comprises an extensible markup language file (paragraph [0060] "An

XML element of the type Resource is a resource of the application (e.g., a binary file, a

configuration file, a directory, a Web page)").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art

at the time the invention was made to incorporate the method of wherein the

branding manifest comprises an extensible markup language file as taught by Becker

into the method of branding software as taught by Ortiz. The modification would be

obvious because of one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated use the

resource files as a XML files to provide user a flexibility to change or update to

resource files on the fly as suggested by Becker (paragraph [0012]).

Per claims 15:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and further, Ortiz does not explicitly

disclose wherein the software product comprises a plurality of binary files organized

into components, each of said components having a component manifest associated

therewith for identifying the component and specifying one or more dependencies of the

component, and further comprising specifying a dependency from at least one selected

component to the interface for accessing the branding resources to be installed in

connection with the selected component.

However, Becker discloses in an analogous computer system wherein the

software product comprises a plurality of binary files organized into components, each

of said components having a component manifest associated therewith for identifying

the component (paragraph [0060] "An XML element of the type Resource is a resource

of the application (e.g., a binary file, a configuration file, a directory, a Web page)") and

specifying one or more dependencies of the component, and further comprising

specifying a dependency from at least one selected component to the interface for

accessing the branding resources to be installed in connection with the selected

component (paragraph [0066] "...The element CheckDependency checks for the

existence of an installation of another component on the target server... element can

include XML attributes...Component Version (a version of the XML element component

to check for dependency), InstallPath (an installation path of the corresponding

component), and BooleanDependency (a relationship to a version of the installed

component, e.g., equal, greater_than, greater_than_equal)").

The feature of wherein the software product comprises a plurality of binary files

organized into components, each of said components having a component manifest

associated therewith for identifying the component and specifying one or more

dependencies of the component, and further comprising specifying a dependency from

at least one selected component to the interface for accessing the branding resources

to be installed in connection with the selected component would be obvious for the

reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 13.

Per claims 16:

The rejection of claim 15 is incorporated and further, Ortiz does not explicitly

disclose wherein specifying the dependency from the selected component to the

interface includes specifying the selected namespace, said selected namespace

corresponding to a specific brand.

However, Becker discloses in an analogous computer system wherein

specifying the dependency from the selected component to the interface includes

specifying the selected namespace, said selected namespace corresponding to a

specific brand (paragraph [0066] "...The element CheckDependency checks for the

existence of an installation of another component on the target server... element can

include XML attributes...Component Version (a version of the XML element component

to check for dependency), InstallPath (an installation path of the corresponding

component), and BooleanDependency (a relationship to a version of the installed

component, e.g., equal, greater_than, greater_than_equal)").

The feature of wherein specifying the dependency from the selected component

to the interface includes specifying the selected namespace, said selected namespace

corresponding to a specific brand would be obvious for the reasons set forth in the

rejection of claim 13.

Per claims 17:

The rejection of claim 16 is incorporated and further, Ortiz does not explicitly

disclose, wherein specifying the selected namespace includes specifying another

namespace corresponding to a different specific brand to modify the branding of the

software product.

However, Becker discloses in an analogous computer system wherein

specifying the selected namespace includes specifying another namespace

corresponding to a different specific brand to modify the branding of the software

product (paragraph [0066] "...The element CheckDependency checks for the existence

of an installation of another component on the target server... element can include XML

attributes...Component Version (a version of the XML element component to check for

dependency), InstallPath (an installation path of the corresponding component), and

BooleanDependency (a relationship to a version of the installed component, e.g., equal,

greater_than, greater_than_equal)").

The feature of wherein specifying the selected namespace includes specifying

another namespace corresponding to a different specific brand to modify the branding

of the software product would be obvious for the reasons set forth in the rejection of

claim 13.

Claim 29 is the computer product claim corresponding to method claims 13 and

rejected under the same rational set forth in connection with the rejection of claim

13, above.

Per claims 42:

The computerized method of claim 39, wherein an extensible markup language file

contains the embedded metadata. The limitations in the claims are similar to those in

claim 13, and rejected under the same rational set forth in connection with the

rejection of claim 13.

Per claims 45:

The computerized method of claim 44, wherein specifying the dependency from the

selected component to the interface includes specifying the selected namespace, said

selected namespace corresponding to a specific brand. The limitations in the claims

are similar to those in claim 16, and rejected under the same rational set forth in

connection with the rejection of claim 16.

Per claims 46:

The computerized method of claim 45, wherein specifying the selected namespace

includes specifying another namespace corresponding to a different specific brand to

modify the branding of the software product. The limitations in the claims are similar

to those in claim 17, and rejected under the same rational set forth in connection

with the rejection of claim 17.

Conclusion

14.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from

the examiner should be directed to **Satish S. Rampuria** whose telephone number

is **(571) 272-3732**. The examiner can normally be reached on **8:30 am to 5:00 pm**

Monday to Friday except every other Friday and federal holidays. Any inquiry of a

general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the

TC 2100 Group receptionist: 571-272-2100.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the

examiner's supervisor, **Wei Y. Zhen** can be reached on **(571) 272-3708**. The fax

phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned

is **571-273-8300.**

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR

only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov.

Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the

Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Satish S. Rampuria
Patent Examiner/Software Engineer
Art Unit 2191

WEI ZHEN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Continuation of Attachment(s) 3). Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08), Paper No(s)/Mail Date :3/21/05,5/18/04,10/21/03,9/02/03.